The Office Action rejects claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2006/0053218 to Thoren, hereafter Thoren.

This rejection is traversed because Thoren lacks the steps of independent method claim 1 and the elements of independent apparatus claim 6.

Independent claim 1 (as a method step) and independent claim 6 (as a program step) recite:

> "detecting a group of said parameter write messages that occur closer together than operator initiated parameter write messages ".

Thoren does not disclose or teach this step. The Examiner contends that paragraphs [0006] and [0016-0018] disclose this step. Paragraph [0006] merely describes in general terms the communication medium used to transfer data between Fieldbus devices and a process control center. This has nothing to do with the above quoted detecting step. Paragraph [0016] describes a reduction in data transfer by limiting the data transfer to values that fall within a specified value range. This has nothing to do with the detection "of a group of said parameter write messages that occur closer together than operator initiated parameter messages" as recited in independent claims 1 and 6. Paragraph [0017] merely states that a user can influence the transfer of data. Paragraph [0018] describes data transfer reduction can be achieved with "a specific time span or specified time on the clock" or "the occurrence of specific events, such as, for example, the attaining and/or exceeding of specified threshold values or alarm criteria".

None of the Examiner cited paragraphs discloses or teaches "a parameter write message" for a Fieldbus device. Thoren is dealing only with the transfer of data arising from the actual running of the process and not with write messages

concerning parameters of the Fieldbus devices. Thoren does not describe or teach the detection "of a group of said parameter write messages that occur closer together than operator initiated parameter messages" as recited in independent claims 1 and 6. Thoren's data transfer reduction techniques do not detect a group of any type of messages that occur closer together than any type of operator initiated messages. In fact, Thoren is only dealing with data that is transferred from the Fieldbus devices to the process control center and not with "parameter write messages" and "operator initiated parameter write messages". Therefore, Thoren lacks the detecting step recited in independent claims 1 and 6.

Independent claim 1 (as a method step) and independent claim 6 (as a program step) also recite:

> "suppressing a communication of errors arising from said group of parameter write messages or a rejection of a parameter write operation, wherein said rejection results from any of said errors arising from said group of parameter write messages".

The Examiner contends that Thoren's paragraph [0018] discloses the suppressing step. As noted above, Thoren's paragraph [0018] does not deal with "parameter write messages". Likewise, Thoren's paragraph [0018] or any other part of Thoren does not describe or teach "a parameter write operation" as recited in the suppressing step. Therefore, Thoren lacks the suppressing step recited in independent claims 1 and 6.

For the reason set forth above, it is submitted that the rejection of claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by Thoren is erroneous and should be withdrawn.

The Office Action cites a number of patents that were not applied in the rejections of the claims. These patents have been reviewed, but are believed to be inapplicable to the claims.

It is respectfully requested for the reasons set forth above that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) withdrawn, that claims 1-10 be allowed and that this application be passed to issue.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: 10/3/06

Paul D. Greeley
Reg. No. 31,019
Attorney for Applicant
Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle, L.L.P.
One Landmark Square, 10th Floor
Stamford, CT 06901-2682
(203) 327-4500